## Monday, May 2<sup>nd</sup> - TAG call highlights

- 1. The Division welcomed everyone to the TAG call and informed payers that the Division will continue to hold daily TAG calls at 2:00 P.M. to address any technical issues.
- 2. The Division addressed payer specific technical questions.
- 3. With no other questions to address, the Division concluded the meeting at 2:30 pm.

## Tuesday, May 3<sup>rd</sup> - TAG call highlights

- 1. The Division welcomed everyone to the TAG call.
- 2. Young Joo thanked payers for their efforts to submit data and updated variance request applications. He encouraged payers to continue to reach out to the Division and communicate through their liaisons. Payers were reminded that the Division anticipates the Variance Request Final Certification Process to be completed by the May 31<sup>st</sup>. When variance request applications have been approved, payers will be required to submit a signed certificate agreeing to the terms of the variance application. Instead of requiring payers to send signed hard copies by postal mail, the Division strongly prefers an email acknowledgement from the designated signatory officer as the primary form of an electronic signature for the certification process. The Division will also accept either a scanned copy of the signed document sent by email, a faxed copy, or a physical copy sent by postal mail.

The Division also acknowledged that occasionally there may be the data element threshold level fluctuations and will account for these variations by applying Margin of Errors for a limited set of the Priority "A" Level elements. A list of the elements was provided in an email to payers.

The Division will also implement Data element priorities and submission edits. Each element will be prioritized with a letter A, B, C or Z (A being most important, Z being least important). If any of the "A" elements do not meet the threshold, the file will fail and the payer will be required to resubmit with appropriate adjustments. Only "A" level edits will cause a file to fail at this time.

- 3. The Division addressed payer specific technical questions.
- 4. With no other questions to address, the Division concluded the meeting at 2:30 pm.

## Wednesday, May 4th - TAG call highlights

- 1. The Division welcomed everyone to the TAG call.
- 2. The Division addressed payer specific technical questions.

3. With no other questions to address, the Division concluded the meeting at 2:30 pm.

# Thursday, May 5<sup>th</sup> - TAG call highlights

- 1. The Division welcomed everyone to the TAG call.
- 2. The Division provided additional guidance and information about steps that will be implemented to ensure data quality through the assignment of data element priorities (A, B, C, and Z), margin of errors for some "A" priority data elements, and the variance request process.

The Division further explained the margin of error in response to questions that have been raised about fluctuations in threshold levels that may extend beyond the Division's applied margin of error. Submissions with "A" level elements that fall outside of the margin of error range that the Division applied, will **cause the file to fail**. As previously stated, the Division will apply a 2% margin of error for some "A" level data elements. While this accounts for some fluctuation, if a payer's submission for a data element falls outside of the applied margin of error, the file will fail.

#### Example of an "A" Level Element with Reporting Error Margin = 2%

A payer that submitted a Variance Request for DC032 = 95% was unable to meet their stated variance within 2%, thus the file FAILS.

		Data Element Name				_	_	Threshold	Percent Passed Records	Result	Field Level
50101	6/3/2011 11:10:18	CDT Code	352	279	21	300	99.00	95.00	93.00	Failed	
							Error Margin	= 95 * .98	93.1		

If a file fails, payers are responsible for contacting the liaisons to discuss the issue and ensure steps are taken to comply with required submission deadlines.

In addition to these efforts to ensure data quality, the Division informed payers that initial data quality analysis would be conducted on the most current submissions. The Division, however, is also committed to reviewing the data submissions from 2008, 2009, and 2010 to ensure these data will meet the analytic needs of government agencies and support administrative simplification. The Division anticipates this review process to continue through the end of the year. As data quality issues are identified, payers will be expected to work collaboratively with the Division staff to resolve these issues and may require payers to resubmit files.

Lastly, the Division continues to evaluate the resources we have developed for payers implementing the all-payer claims database (APCD) and we are open to your

constructive feedback about the additional steps we can take to improve these tools. To that end, the Division has developed a survey tool to help seek your feedback and to consider your ideas for our next phases of planning and development. We encourage feedback from all payer representatives who have been involved with the implementation of the APCD including but not limited to those who are involved with regulatory or government affairs, business, finance, and IT support so please feel free to forward the survey to your colleagues. The nine-question **APCD Survey for Payers** can be accessed directly through this link:

http://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/527642/Survey-on-All-Payer-Claims-Database-ACPD-Tools

- 3. The Division addressed payer specific technical questions.
- 4. With no other questions to address, the Division concluded the meeting at 2:30 pm.

# Friday, May 6<sup>th</sup> - TAG call highlights

- 1. The Division welcomed everyone to the TAG call.
- 2. The Division provided an overview of the issues discussed on TAG call for payers who were unable to participate on Thursday, May 5<sup>th</sup> and invited payers to ask questions and provide any comments.

## Notes copied from Thursday, May 5<sup>th</sup>:

The Division provided additional guidance and information about steps that will be implemented to ensure data quality through the assignment of data element priorities (A, B, C, and Z), margin of errors for some "A" priority data elements, and the variance request process.

The Division further explained the margin of error in response to questions that have been raised about fluctuations in threshold levels that may extend beyond the Division's applied margin of error. Submissions with "A" level elements that fall outside of the margin of error range that the Division applied, will **cause the file to fail**. As previously stated, the Division will apply a 2% margin of error for some "A" level data elements. While this accounts for some fluctuation, if a payer's submission for a data element falls outside of the applied margin of error, the file will fail.

#### Example of an "A" Level Element with Reporting Error Margin = 2%

A payer that submitted a Variance Request for DC032 = 95% was unable to meet their stated variance within 2%, thus the file FAILS.

		Data Element Name	,			_	-	Threshold	Percent Passed Records	Result	Field Level
50101	6/3/2011 11:10:18	CDT Code	352	279	21	300	99.00	95.00	93.00	Failed	

### APCD Daily TAG Call – Meeting Highlights (May 2nd – May 6th)

			Error	= 95 * .98	93.1	
			Margin			

If a file fails, payers are responsible for contacting the liaisons to discuss the issue and ensure steps are taken to comply with required submission deadlines.

In addition to these efforts to ensure data quality, the Division informed payers that initial data quality analysis would be conducted on the most current submissions. The Division, however, is also committed to reviewing the data submissions from 2008, 2009, and 2010 to ensure these data will meet the analytic needs of government agencies and support administrative simplification. The Division anticipates this review process to continue through the end of the year. As data quality issues are identified, payers will be expected to work collaboratively with the Division staff to resolve these issues and may require payers to resubmit files.

Lastly, the Division continues to evaluate the resources we have developed for payers implementing the all-payer claims database (APCD) and we are open to your constructive feedback about the additional steps we can take to improve these tools. To that end, the Division has developed a survey tool to help seek your feedback and to consider your ideas for our next phases of planning and development. We encourage feedback from all payer representatives who have been involved with the implementation of the APCD including but not limited to those who are involved with regulatory or government affairs, business, finance, and IT support so please feel free to forward the survey to your colleagues. The nine-question APCD Survey for Payers can be accessed directly through this link:

http://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/527642/Survey-on-All-Payer-Claims-Database-ACPD-Tools

- 3. With no specific questions about discussion from Thursday, May 5<sup>th</sup>, the Division invited payer specific technical questions.
- 4. With no other questions to address, the Division concluded the meeting at 2:30 pm.